

**REMARKS**

New claim 28 is added, hence, claims 1-28 are all the claims pending in the application.

The Abstract is amended as required in Office Action. The claims are amended in general placing the claims in a more customary form according to U.S. practice, correcting informalities and removing the term “characterized.” Also, claims 5 and 6 are amended to remove the term “it”, as required by the Examiner. It is respectfully submitted that the claims would be patentable without the amendments.

The Office Action, in numbered paragraph 7 states “Claims 1-25 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting over claims 1-27 of Application No. 10/678,213.” Since the rejection is a provisional rejection at this time, Applicant reserves the right to submit a Terminal Disclaimer when either the ‘213 Application issues as a patent or all the claims in the present application are allowable and the application contains a claim that is subject to the provisional rejection.

Claims 1-5, 12 and 24-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. 6,356,806 to Grob et al. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection since Grob does not disclose all the claimed limitations.

Applicant respectfully submits that Grob does not disclose, for example, the limitations recited in claim 1 of the “additional motion control means.” Applicant notes that in Appln. No. 10/678,213, discussed above, the Examiner agrees that Grob does not teach all the limitations that are recited in claim 1 here, since the Examiner indicates in the ‘213 Application that similar limitations are allowable. Claim 6 in the ‘213 Application, which the Examiner has deemed allowable, recites, for example, a limitation directed to an additional motion control means that is

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.111  
USSN: 10/678,270

Q77100

similar to a corresponding limitation in claim 1 of the present application. Grob does not disclose at least that limitation. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that Grob does not anticipate claim 1. The remaining claims depend from claim 1, and hence, are patentable for at least the same reason.

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephone interview, the Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,



J. Warren Lytle, Jr.  
Registration No. 39,283

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC  
Telephone: (202) 293-7060  
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860

WASHINGTON OFFICE

**23373**

CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: March 22, 2006